

Remarks

The paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

1. The Examiner indicated that "claims 1-16 are pending in the current application. Claims 17-25 were cancelled via Paper No. 11. Claim 1 was amended via the applicant's response filed June 11, 2004." The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 § 102

2. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 102, which form the basis for the rejections under this section in the Office action. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

3. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bezos". The applicant has previously requested that claim 1, on which claims 2-5, 7-14 and 16 depend and which incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, be amended to more clearly point out that in applicant's invention a custom product page is dynamically generated based on the populated template and an identified on-line marketplace for each product which is to be marketed. The applicant has carefully examined the cited reference and finds no disclosure of dynamically generating a custom product page as claimed by the applicant. In response the Examiner states that:

"Dynamically generating a custom product page based on said populated template and an identified on-line marketplace from said selected group of on-line market places for each individual product from said product

information database to be marketed on one or more of said on-line marketplaces (at least column 11, lines 43-65)".

The applicant has carefully reviewed the cited reference and in particular the cited column 11, lines 43-65, which reads as follows:

"Figure 6 illustrates an example HTML catalog document (Web page) 120 in accordance with the present invention. The customer views the product catalog document 120 via the Web browser 112 in order to select a particular product (book) offered through the associate's Web site 100. In this example, the catalog document 120 comprises a graphic icon 600 that is a scaled-down replica of an actual book cover. The graphic icon 600 also functions as a hyperlink, allowing the customer to click on the icon with a mouse in order to link to the merchant Web site 106. The document 120 includes the title 602 and author of the book 604, and includes an editorial description and recommendation of the book 606 from the associate. The catalog document 120 also contains another textual hyperlink 608, allowing the customer to link to the merchant Web site 106 and initiate referral transaction processing. Typically, the associate's product catalog (which may include multiple catalog pages) contains several referral links (with different product Ids), each corresponding to a different product sold by the merchant."

and has failed to find any reference to at least the following recited elements of claim 1: "dynamically generating a custom product page"; "based on a populated template and an identified on-line marketplace"; "from a selected group of on-line marketplaces": for each individual product"; "from said product information database to be marketed on one or more of said on-line marketplaces." In particular, there is no reference to the step of "dynamically generating" the "custom product page." Nor is there any mention of "populated templates" in the Bezos et al. reference. Rather this reference suggests that Bezos et al. describes the viewing of a preexisting product catalog document instead of the dynamically generated custom product page of applicant's claimed invention, since there is no suggestion that the catalog document is modified based on either a populated

template or an identified on-line marketplace. Again, the feature of applicant's invention that provides automatic customization of the product template based on the selected e-commerce marketplace and is not merely a "product-specific Web site" as described in the cited reference. Therefore, applicant believes that this combination of features are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference, or any other known reference. Moreover, Since claims 2-5, 7-14 and 16 depend on claim 1, which the applicant has previously amended and which includes limitations not found or suggested in the cited reference, the applicant believes that this previously requested amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), which form the basis for all obviousness rejections under this section in the Office action. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
5. The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 15 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141, in view of Official Notice". As noted above, the applicant has previously requested that claim 1, on which claims 6 and 15 depend and which incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, be amended to more clearly point out that applicant's invention includes a "dynamically generated" custom product page based on the "populated template" and an identified on-line marketplace for each product which is to be marketed and that in applicant's invention the appearance and features of the templates are dynamically adjusted based on the selected group of on-line marketplaces. The applicant believes that the combination of steps, as defined in the

amended claims, is neither described nor suggested by the cited or any other known references. Since claims 6 and 15 depend on claims 1, which the applicant has amended, the applicant believes that this requested amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Arguments

6. The Examiner indicated that he had considered the applicant's previous arguments "but they are not persuasive." Although, the applicant does not believe that a specific response is required for this paragraph, the applicant wishes to point out that although, the Examiner stated that he believes that "Bezos discloses a method wherein a custom product page is dynamically generated based on said populated template and an identified on-line market place from said selected group of on-line marketplaces for each individual product from said product information database to be marketed on one or more of said on-line marketplaces," the applicant has carefully reviewed the Bezos et al. reference and notes that there is no reference to a "custom product page", a "template" and that the only references to "dynamically generated pages" refer to displaying the contents of the "shopping cart" or including a "customer ID" within the hyperlinks of the detail page. Therefore, applicant has concluded that this Bezos et al. reference does not disclose a custom product page that is dynamically generated as described and claimed in applicants presently presented claims. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and especially appreciates that the Examiner cited particular columns and line numbers for the convenience of the applicant. The applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggestion

and has searched not only the cited columns and numbers, but has also searched the entire Bezos et al. reference and has failed to find all of the elements of the applicant's claims.

Accordingly, the applicant continues to respectfully assert that claim 1, as amended in the response filed on May 9, 2003, is not disclosed or suggested by the Bezos reference or any other known reference, since, besides other elements, claim 1 includes the explicit element of "e-commerce marketplace filters" which is neither described nor suggested in the cited reference. The applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims of this application.

Conclusion


7. The Examiner has indicated that "this action is made final" and has reminded the applicant of the extension of time policy. The applicant is responding to this "final" action with a Request for Continued Examination and fee along with a Petition for Extension of Time and fee within the permitted extension period under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The applicant respectfully requests continued examination and entry of this response.]

8. The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assistance regarding this case and believes no response to this paragraph is necessary.

The applicant has previously requested that claim 1 be amended as described. The applicant has described why the applicant believes that claim 1 as presently presented is neither described nor suggested by the cited or any other known references. Applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been

addressed. Applicant believes that claims 1-16 are patentable over all known prior art, claims 2-16 being dependent on the amended claim 1 and therefore including its limitations. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 24th day of January, 2005.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154
SNELL & WILMER, LLP
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 257-1960
Facsimile: (801) 257-1800